

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/689,656	10/22/2003	Mikhail Kejzelman	003301-054	6495
	7590 03/15/200 INGERSOLL & ROO	EXAMINER		
POST OFFICE		KESSLER, CHRISTOPHER S		
ALEXANDRIA	A, VA 22313-1404		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1742	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/15/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/689,656	KEJZELMAN ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Christopher Kessler	1742		

	Christopher Kessler	1742				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 20 February 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.						
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods: The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70 	the same day as filing a Notice of ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in a se with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must of the final rejection. dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	Appeal. To avoid aba fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C ust be filed within one in the final rejection, who gate of the final rejecti	ice, which FR 41.31; or (3) of the following ichever is later. In			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri inally set in the final Offi te of the final rejection, o	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as even if timely filed,			
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belov (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a content of the co	nsideration and/or search (see NO w); ter form for appeal by materially re	TE below);				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			•			
 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	:					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ll be entered and an e	explanation of			
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 20-30, 34-40, 48, 51. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	•		. •			
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	t before or on the date of filing a No d sufficient reasons why the affidav	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> it or other evidence is	t be entered necessary and			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. So	al and/or appellant fai ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	ls to provide a			
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	•	-				
11. \(\subseteq \text{ The request for reconsideration has been considered but } \) \(\subseteq \text{See Continuation Sheet.} \)		n condition for allowar	ice because:			
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)					

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. 112 is valid. The scope of claim 20 is not met in the specification, or in original claims 7-9. The disclosure of using an internal lubricant does not disclose a specific exclusion of the use of external lubrication, as one of ordinary skill in the art would understand. Applicant has sought to use this feature of "without external lubrication" to distinguish the invention over the prior art, but such feature is not taught by the instant specification.

The rejection of claim 20 under 35 U. S. C. 103 is valid. Although the use of external lubricant at pressures of over 800 MPa is not explicitly disclosed in Ozaki, such a process is within the overall scope of the disclosure of Ozaki. The Examiner further points out that rationale to modify a reference need not be cited in the art, but may be reasoned from common knowledge in the art (see MPEP §2144). Further, Ozaki does not teach away from Applicant's invention, as Ozaki teaches that the use of external lubrication and pressures of 1177 MPa for a similar powder yields better density results than those claimed by Applicant (see Table 1 or Table 7). Thus, Applicant's claimed process would yield no unexpected results.

In the Remarks of 20 February 2007, Applicant states that claims 1-30, 34-40, 48 and 51 are pending in the application. This is incorrect. The Examiner notes that claims 1-19 have been cancelled, as marked on the claims submitted 20 February 2007, for example.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher Kessler whose telephone number is (571) 272-6510. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on (571) 272-1244.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ROY KING

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECH NOON SENTED 1700